

**REMARKS**

Claims 22, 23, 25-27 and 29-42 are now in this application.

After filing the amendment of November 18, 2008, applicants' representative noticed for the first time that claim 28 was in fact rejected over prior art in the same paragraph in which claim 24 was alternatively rejected, i.e., claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Jay et al. in view of Waffler et al. Any inconvenience which may have resulted from the representative's oversight is sincerely regretted.

By the amendment, the language of claims 28 and 24 was directly incorporated into claim 22. Accordingly, the limitations of claim 22 are now identical to former claim 28.

The examiner did in fact reject former claim 28 as unpatentable over Jay et al. in view of Waffler et al.

But this combination of references does not teach the structure of present claim 22 in that neither reference teaches structure which includes a valve piston (3) slidably supported in the valve insert (2) with the spring which biases it being braced against the valve holder (1), and particularly wherein the valve holder has a steplike transition which is seated on the valve insert.

In Jay et al. element 15 braces the spring. And even if, as the examiner has read Jay et al, elements 14 and 15 are consider together as the valve holder, this valve holder does not have a steplike transition which is seated on the valve insert.

Waffler et al. have an inlet at end 14 and an outlet 38. The only element in Waffler et al. which could be considered to be a valve piston would be head portion 88 which is slidable in sleeve 76, or as the examiner has pointed out, this makes it slidable within the structure 12,

which the examiner calls an insert. But this is not a fair reading, as element 12 is the valve housing.

However, even if, for arguments sake, it were admitted that housing 12 could be considered to be an insert, and applicants certainly do not admit such, it is pointed out that the valve holder of Waffler et al, which braces the spring, is pressure adjustment member 56, which is adjustable within cap member 46 via threaded aperture 54. And the valve holder 56 does not have a steplike transition which is seated on the valve insert 12. And if, again only for argument sake, it were admitted that housing 12 could be considered to be the insert, then perhaps cap member 46 should also be considered to be part of the insert since it is tightened by threads 48 to effectively become solid with housing 12. But under these considerations, the rejection still fails because holder member 56 is threaded to cap 46 at threads 54 to allow for adjustment, so that the connection between holder member 56 and the insert is still not a steplike seating, it is a threaded connection which is necessary within Waffler et al. to allow for adjustment.

It can also be stated that none of the other cited prior art teaches structure such as recited in present claim 22. Jay et al. certainly does not have the structure as recited in present claim 22. Likewise, Yie does not have a valve holder formed in a steplike fashion which is seated on the valve insert. And likewise, none of Lindeboom, Lauer et al, and Wierich has a valve holder formed in a steplike fashion which is seated on the valve insert.

Appl. No. 10/549,576  
Supplemental Amdt dated November 19, 2008  
In furtherance of the Reply to the Office action of June 18, 2008

For these reasons, in addition to the reasons submitted in the amendment of November 18, 2008, entry of this supplemental response and allowance of the claims are courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'R.E. Greigg', is written over the printed name and registration information.

Ronald E. Greigg  
Registration No. 31,517  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 02119

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.  
1423 Powhatan Street  
Suite One  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Tel. (703) 838-5500  
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/SLS/ncr

J:\Boach\R304929\Supplemental Response of 6-18-08 OA.wpd